

Memorandum

JE Fuller/ Hydrology & Geomorphology, Inc.

MEETING DATE: March 19, 2009

MEETING TIME: 9:00AM – 11:15AM

MEETING LOCATION: Maricopa County Planning and Development
501 N. 44th Street
Phoenix, AZ

DISTRIBUTION: Meeting Attendees

FROM: W. Scott Ogden, P.E. - JEF

**RE: Maricopa County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan
2009 Update**

ATTENDEES:

Tom Abbott	City of Tempe
Jim Begansky	Maricopa County
Meredith Bond	Maricopa County
Tom Christmas	Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Gil Damiani	City of Mesa
Mike DeBenedetto	City of Phoenix
Pat Farmer	Town of Carefree
Michael K. Gease	Flood Control District of Maricopa County
Sheri Gibbons	Town of Gilbert
Bob Hansen	City of Tolleson
Cristina Herrera	Maricopa County
Dewey Horton	Town of Buckeye
Lee Jimenez	Flood Control District of Maricopa County
Glenn Jones	City of Peoria
Lorenzo Jones	City of Scottsdale
Joe LaFortune	Town of Queen Creek
Scott LaGreca	Town of Fountain Hills
Richard Langevin	Maricopa County
Bob Lee	Town of Paradise Valley
Howard Munding	Town of El Mirage
Othell Newbill	City of Goodyear
Chris Ochs	City of Glendale
Patrick O'Toole	Salt River Project
Harry Parsi	Town of Gila Bend
Kevin Pool	City of Surprise
Cliff Puckett	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Debra Sheff	City of Glendale
Art Snapp	City of Avondale
Adam Stein	Town of Cave Creek
Jeri Todd	City of Phoenix
Mitch Wagner	Maricopa County
Marc Walker	City of Chandler
Ken Waters	National Weather Service

Maricopa County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan
2009 Update

Steve Waters Flood Control District of Maricopa County
Sue Wood Arizona Division of Emergency Management

Consultants:

Mike Kellogg JE Fuller/ Hydrology & Geomorphology, Inc.
W. Scott Ogden JE Fuller/ Hydrology & Geomorphology, Inc.

AGENDA

- 1. PROJECT STATUS REVIEW**
- 2. PROMULGATION SCHEDULE REVIEW**
- 3. CPRI REVIEW – FINAL HAZARD LIST**
- 4. ASSET INVENTORY INTRODUCTION**
- 5. OTHER DATA NEEDS**

DISCUSSION

Agenda Item 1:

- C. Herrera opened the meeting by thanking all participants for their attendance. She then turned the meeting mover to S. Ogden.
- NOTE – The following jurisdictions were not represented at the meeting:
 - Gila River Indian Community
 - Guadalupe
 - Litchfield Park
 - Wickenburg
 - Youngtown
- S. Ogden discussed the status of the public involvement template documents. The documents will be ready for distribution to the participating jurisdictions within the next two weeks. He commended those jurisdictions who have already posted a notice of the Plan Update on their website.
- S. Ogden discussed the status of the local planning team lists (previous homework assignment). As of the date of this meeting the following jurisdictions had not submitted their local planning lists:
 - Carefree
 - Gila Bend
 - Guadalupe
 - Litchfield Park
 - Wickenburg
 - Youngtown
- S. Ogden discussed the status of the CPRI evaluations. As of the date of this meeting the following jurisdictions had not submitted their CPRI evaluations:
 - Gila Bend
 - Litchfield Park
 - Wickenburg
 - Youngtown

Agenda Item 2:

- S. Ogden reviewed the key milestone dates for the project. Those discussed included:
 - Step 1
 - A full draft of the Plan to be submitted to the Multi-Jurisdiction Planned Team (MJPT) by July 1.
 - MJPT two-week review period.
 - Final draft of the Plan to be completed by August 1.
 - Step 2
 - Submit draft Plan to ADEM and FEMA within the first week of August
 - Expected 1-2 month FEMA review period.
 - Step 3
 - Anticipated receipt of FEMA “approvable pending adoption” letter by October 1.
 - Step 4
 - Jurisdictions will promulgate and submit official resolution of adoption to ADEM and FEMA.
 - Step 5
 - FEMA will set the “official” plan approval date to the date of the first resolution received.
- S. Ogden discussion potential Plan document formats. The potential formats included:
 - Plan Format 1 – This format is a true multi-jurisdictional plan and will include all jurisdictional information in one document that may possibly spread across two volumes. Under this format, each Tribe will have a separate Annex to provide the additional material required for a Tribal Plan. This format will include a 5-10 page Executive Summary for each jurisdiction that summarizes the critical elements of the plan for that jurisdiction and could be used to distribute to city councils, boards, etc.
 - Plan Format 2 – This format will include a primary volume containing information pertinent to all jurisdictions with separate Annex volumes for each jurisdiction.
 - Several members of the MJPT requested one-week to discuss the Plan format options with their local planning team. S. Ogden agreed to a one-week time frame.
 - The MJPT decided in general to adopt the Plan Format 1 as it will best represent a true Multi-Jurisdictional Plan, will be more efficient and will best demonstrate the spirit of multi-jurisdictional cooperation. This decision was made pending any serious objections by those communities doing further checking.

Agenda Item 3:

- S. Ogden distributed a CPRI summary table listing each jurisdiction’s CPRI worksheet results (except those not reporting). The table also listed the average CPRI

score for each hazard included in the CPRI worksheet. The two lowest hazard averages were *Landslide/Mudslide* and *Levee Failure*.

- S. Ogden led a discussion to review and revise the hazard categories based on the CPRI results.
 - The hazard of *Landslide/Mudslide* was discussed and the MJPT was questioned as to what communities had a serious desire to provide mitigation for this hazard. MCDOT and Paradise Valley were the only communities to respond and most of the concern was due to slides that resulted from wildfire or minor rockslides. After further discussion, the MJPT chose to drop *Landslide/Mudslide* from the list.
 - A proposal to merge the *Thunderstorm/High Wind* and *Tornado* categories into a new category titled *Severe Wind Event* was discussed. The reasoning is that the damaging element for both *Thunderstorm/High Wind* and *Tornado* is the severe wind as well as any reasonable mitigation strategies. The thunderstorm component of hail was discussed and it was decided by the MJPT that the hazard was not significant enough to warrant further consideration. The MJPT agreed to the merging.

Agenda Item 4:

- S. Ogden presented a discussion on the asset inventory part of the Vulnerability Analysis component of the Plan, including a definition for critical facilities and infrastructure and a list of general categories. A memorandum providing detailed guidance for developing the asset inventory was distributed.
- S. Ogden presented the database format in which the asset inventory information is to be organized.
- The following were discussed in detail:
 - Critical Facilities – the definition of Critical Facilities was given and discussed.
 - Each jurisdiction was instructed to use the definition in determining whether an asset is assigned a Critical or Non-Critical classification.
 - Critical Facility general categories were listed and discussed.
 - Non-Critical Facilities – this category is to be used for all assets not assigned a Critical Facility classification.
 - Non-Critical Facility general categories were listed and discussed.
- S. Ogden discussed and presented examples of the “starter” dataset of assets that will be provided to each jurisdiction by JEF. These “starter” datasets were derived from a database file provided to JEF by the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG).
- S. Ogden informed the MJPT that the “starter” set will be distributed to each jurisdiction within three business days following the meeting. Each jurisdiction was instructed to review complete, and/or modify the “starter” asset dataset to reflect the assets they wish to have included in the Vulnerability Analysis component of the Plan.
- Several members of the MJPT expressed concern about sharing information on critical facilities within their jurisdictions due to restrictions placed on dissemination

of asset inventory data by state and federal agencies. A statewide critical infrastructure information system is currently being housed at the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center (ACTIC) in Phoenix. Communities participating with ACTIC are leery of violating security agreements by providing data to JEF for the vulnerability analysis. MCDEM assured the MJPT that JEF signed a non-disclosure agreement as a part of their contract.

- M. Benedetto will schedule a meeting with ACTIC to discuss the concerns and S. Ogden agreed to attend and present the need for the data on behalf of the MJPT.

Agenda Item 5:

- S. Ogden discussed two other data sets needed from each community:
 - City Boundaries – each community needs to provide JEF with the most current municipal boundary. Preferred format would be as GIS shapefiles. JEF will prepare check plots for verification by each community that does not send shapefiles.
 - Future Critical Facilities – each community shall provide information regarding planned future critical facilities on a 5-year horizon.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. MJPT to discuss Plan Format needs with local planning team as needed and report back to S. Ogden no later than March 27th.
2. S. Ogden will distribute an email with a list of the MJPT selected hazards and will request each jurisdiction to provide a return email listing the hazards that the community will develop mitigation actions/projects for. The return list is due by April 3, 2009.
3. M. Benedetto will schedule a meeting with ACTIC to discuss the asset inventory concerns and S. Ogden will attend and present the need for the data on behalf of the MJPT.
4. S. Ogden will distribute the “starter” asset inventory dataset to each jurisdiction within three business days of the March 19 meeting. Each jurisdiction shall review, complete, and/or modify the list and provide to JEF by April 14th, 2009.
5. Each jurisdiction (except the county) will provide JEF with the most current municipal boundary. Preferred format would be GIS shapefiles. JEF will prepare check plots for verification by each community that does not send shapefiles.
6. Each community shall provide information regarding planned future critical facilities that are intended for construction in the next 5-years. Information can be a written summary or provided in manner similar to the asset inventory data.

Next Meeting

April 16, 2009
9am to 11am
Flood Control District of Maricopa County
Operations Building – Dreamy Draw Conference Room
2801 W. Durango, Phoenix